Page 9

REMARKS

In this paper, claims 1 and 24 are currently amended. After entry of the above amendment, claims 1-24 are pending.

Fig. 1 has been amended to include reference number (30) to show the first shift control unit (30) disposed on the bottom bracket.

Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite.

Claim 24 has been amended to clarify that the shift unit is adapted to attempt to engage the chain with at least one of i) a laterally innermost front sprocket in combination with a laterally outermost rear sprocket and ii) a laterally outermost front sprocket in combination with a laterally innermost rear sprocket, but the prohibiting unit causes the shift unit to engage the chain with a different front sprocket than the attempted front sprocket. Such language should eliminate any confusion.

Claims 1-21, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Campagnolo (US 6,634,971). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the prohibiting unit provides signals so that the chain is prohibited from engaging at least one prohibited sprocket combination comprising at least one of i) a laterally innermost front sprocket in combination with a laterally outermost rear sprocket, and ii) a laterally outermost front sprocket in combination with a laterally innermost rear sprocket; wherein the prohibiting unit detects when the front derailleur and the rear derailleur are positioned such that shifting the front derailleur or the rear derailleur to execute a shift command would cause the front derailleur and the rear derailleur to engage the at least one prohibited sprocket combination.

Campagnolo discloses an apparatus for determining whether the bicycle is being pedaled in the forward direction and prevents all shift attempts when the chain is stationary or moving backwards. Campagnolo is silent about preventing the chain from engaging any particular sprocket combination, and there is no mechanism adapted to detect when the front derailleur and the rear KAZUHIRO TAKEDA, et al Application No.: 10/708,169

Page 10

derailleur are positioned such that shifting the front derailleur or the rear derailleur to execute a shift command would cause the front derailleur and the rear derailleur to engage a prohibited sprocket combination

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Campagnolo in view of Tysver (US 6,007,441). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed for the same reasons noted above.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102, §103 and §112 have been overcome by the foregoing amendment and remarks, and it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Deland

Reg. No. 31,242

DELAND LAW OFFICE P.O. Box 69 Klamath River, California 96050 (530) 465-2430